

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/805.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. (i) S. P. Sharma, Contractor, C/o M/s Vardhman Spinning Mills Ltd. (Rolling Mills Division) Plot No. 264, Sector-24, Faridabad, (ii) M/s Vardhman Spinning and General Mills Ltd., (Rolling Mills Division), 264/24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 370/1983

between

SHRI SURESH DASS, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S (I) S. P. SHARMA,
CONTRACTOR C/O M/S VARDHMAN SPINNING MILLS LTD., (ROLLING MILLS
DIVISION), PLOT No. 264, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD. (II) M/S VARDHMAN
SPINNING AND GENERAL MILLS LTD. (ROLLING MILLS DIVISION)
264/24, FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Duli Chand along with Shri Pawan Mehta for Management.

None for the workman

AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Shri Suresh Dass, Workman and the Management of M/s. (I) S. P. Sharma, Contractor, C/o M/s Vardhman Spinning Mills Ltd. (Rolling Mills Division), Plot No. 264, Sector-24, Faridabad (ii) M/s Vardhman Spinning and General Mills Ltd. (Rolling Mills Division), 264/24, Faridabad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Suresh Dass was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices were issued to both the parties. It may be mentioned that on the last date of hearing, none appeared on behalf of the workman even though he was represented previously and as such *ex parte* proceedings were ordered against the workman. Shri Pawan Mehta Personnel Officer of the management and Shri Duli Chand representative of the management, stated that the dispute between the workman and the management had already been settled,—*vide* settlement Ex. M-1 and affidavit of the workman was Ex. M-2 in that respect, which were correct, and that the workman had already received Rs. 250/- in full and final settlement of his claim as per settlement and that no dispute was now left between the parties. In view of the testimony of Shri Pawan Mehta personnel Officer of the management and Shri Duli Chand representative of the management and recitals made in the documents, Ex. M-1 and M-2, the dispute between the parties stands settled. The award is passed accordingly.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,

Dated, the 29th January, 1985.

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 96, dated the 29th March, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R.N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.